



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/434,382	11/05/1999	SEAN V. TAVTIGIAN	2318-247	3879

6449 7590 07/01/2003

ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST & MANBECK, P.C.
1425 K STREET, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

HOLLERAN, ANNE L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1642

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2003

18

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/434,382

Applicant(s)

TAVTIGIAN ET AL.

Examiner

Anne Holleran

Art Unit

1642

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the reverse with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 January 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 11-15, 61-63 and 67-77 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 14, 15, 76 and 77 is/are allowed.

- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 11-13, 61-63 and 67-75 is/are rejected.

- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 03 January 2003 has been entered.

2. The amendment August 1, 2002 (Paper No. 16) is acknowledged.

Claims 1-3, 11-15, 61-63 and 67-77 are pending and examined on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. Claims 11-13 and 67-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for isolated vectors and isolated host cells comprising said vectors, does not reasonably provide enablement for vectors and host cells comprised within a transgenic animal or an animal or human being having been treated by gene therapy. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. .

Claims 12 and 67-75 are drawn to expression vectors and host cells comprising nucleotide sequences that encodes a polypeptide of SEQ ID NO: 2, or comprising the complement. The specification contemplates the use of the instant polynucleotides for

Art Unit: 1642

the production of transgenic animals (pages 32-34) and in gene therapy (pages 42-45), however, the specification is not enabling for these uses for the following reasons:

(A) As drawn to gene therapy.

The instant specification does not teach how to overcome problems with in vivo delivery and expression with respect to the administration of the claimed nucleic acids or viral vectors comprising said nucleic acids. The state of the art as of the priority date sought for the instant application is that in vivo gene delivery is not well developed and is highly unpredictable. For instance Verma (Nature, 1997, Vol. 389, pp. 239-242) teach that the Achilles heel of gene therapy is gene delivery. Verma state that the ongoing problem is the inability to deliver genes efficiently and to obtain sustained expression (page 239, column 3). Eck (Gene-Based Therapy, In: The Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics, Goodman and Gilman, Ed.s, 1996, pp. 77-101) teach that the fate of the DNA vector itself with regard to the volume of distribution, rate of clearance into tissues etc., the in vivo consequences of altered gene expression and protein function, the fraction of vector taken up by the target cell population, the trafficking of the genetic material within cellular organelles, the rate of degradation of the DNA the level of mRNA produced, the stability of the mRNA produced in vivo, the amount and stability of the protein produced and the protein's compartmentalization or fate within the cell are primary considerations regarding effective therapy. Eck state that these factors differ dramatically on the vector used, the protein being produced, and the disease being treated (Eck et al bridging pages 81-82).

The specification does not remedy any of the deficiencies or the prior art with regard to gene therapy. Given the lack of any guidance from the specification on any of

Art Unit: 1642

the above issues pointed out by Verma or Eck. One of skill in the art would be subject to undue experimentation without reasonable expectation of success in order to practice the methods of claims.

(B) as drawn to a transgenic animal

The specification states on pages 32-34 that genetically engineered host cells can be used to produce transgenic non-human animals. The specification does not provide guidance in the making of a transgenic animal comprising the instant recombinant polynucleotides or transformed cells. In the art of producing transgenic animals, the phenotype of the resultant transgenic animal is not always predictable or viable. The vectors to be used for directing the expression of transgenes in a given tissue or in all tissues must contain the appropriate regulatory regions (Houdebine, Journal of Biotechnology, 1994, Vol. 34, pp. 269-287, see bridging pages 272-273) and expression is heavily dependent on the site of integration in the host genome, and the site of integration is presently unpredictable (Houdebine, page 277, column 1). Therefore, it is concluded that one of skill in the art would undergo undue experimentation in order to make the instant recombinant polynucleotides and cells within a transgenic animal.

Amendment of the claims to recite both "isolated vector" and "isolated host cell" would overcome this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 1642

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3 and 61-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by New England Biolabs (1993/1994 Catalog).

Claims 1-3 and 61-63 are drawn to nucleic acids that are complementary to nucleic acids that encode SEQ ID NO: 1, that comprise SEQ ID NO: 1, SEQ ID NO: 3, or SEQ ID NO: 28. The claims do not recite that the complementary nucleic acids are completely or fully complementary and do not recite size limitations. Therefore, the claims encompass hexamer nucleic acid molecules as described in the New England Biolabs Catalog. Therefore, New England Biolabs teaches nucleic acid molecules that are the same as that claimed.

Conclusion


Claims 14, 15, 76 and 77 are allowable. Claims 1-3, 11-13, 61-53 and 67-75 are rejected.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Office should be directed to Anne Holleran, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (703) 308-8892. Examiner Holleran can normally be reached Monday through Friday, 9:30 am to 2:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa, Ph.D. can be reached at (703) 308-3995.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at telephone number (703) 308-0196.

Anne L. Holleran
Patent Examiner
June 27, 2003


ANTHONY C. CAPUTA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600